

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-37 are now in the application. The independent claims 1 and 22, as well as their dependent claims, where necessary, have been amended. Claims 36 and 37 have been added.

More specifically, the claims have been clarified throughout that the "second information" pertains to the "calling user." That is, the first information that originates from a given user is related to the second information by way of "ownership." The second information (e.g., ID, access authorization, user preferences, services available to the user, etc.) provides information relating to the same user who is the source of the first information.

The first information "originates" from the user. It will be understood that this packet need not have been formed directly at the node, by it may have hopped through other nodes in the network.

While the term "calling user" does not appear as such in the original specification, the added language is nevertheless clearly supported. It is clear throughout the specification that the "user" who is the origin of the "first information" is the same "user" to which the "second information" pertains. Reference is had, by way of example, to page 26, where the processes in the routing engine RE are explained.

Claims 36 and 37 largely correspond with claims 1 and 22, respectively. There, the "calling user" appears as a "given user" so that it is clearly understood that the first-mentioned user is the same as the second-mentioned user.

The entry and favorable consideration of the claims is solicited.

We now turn to the art rejection, in which the claims were rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by Voit et al. or as being obvious under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103 over combinations of Voit et al. with Dobbins and Liebowitz et al.. We respectfully traverse on the basis of the amended claims.

The Examiner statements in response to the last argument are well taken. For example, the Examiner contends that “finding gateway which serves called telephone number” may be read on the concept of the claimed second information. As broadly interpreted, this may be true. The claims, as amended, now eliminate this broad reading. The second information now clearly pertains to the originating user. The data packet is passed onto a route that is defined by the combination of the first and second information. The target address, of course, is contained in the first information (i.e., a packet has to have an address). The packets in Voit et al. also have to have a target address. The VoIP telephony system described by the reference could not function if the packets were not properly addressed. In fact, Voit et al. primarily pertain to the interface between the telephone system and the packet-oriented network. There is nothing in the reference that would point to a system in which a second piece of information relating to the sender (which is present in the network node or distributed in the network, but available to the node), is used to define a routing of the data packet.

The Examiner’s comment that “[w]hen queried with a called number, C1 returns IP address of gateway that serves called telephone number” is well taken as well. Applicants believe that this statement properly describes Voit et al.. The claimed invention, of course, is different. Here, the “first information” (e.g., source address) is taken from the data packet originating from a calling user. The “second information” is available to the node (either in the node, or distributed throughout the network) and it relates to the calling user or to services available to the calling user.

The secondary reference to Dobbins has been cited with regard to its error management disclosure. The reference may indeed be pertinent to claims 5 and 6, but it does not make up for the shortcomings of the primary reference Voit et al.. The independent claims are patentable over the combined teachings of Voit et al. and Dobbins.

The secondary reference to Liebowitz et al. has been cited with regard to its "helpdesk" disclosure. The reference does not make up for the shortcomings of the primary reference Voit et al. with regard to the claims. The independent claims are patentable over the combined teachings of Voit et al. and Liebowitz et al..

None of the references, whether taken alone or in combination, either show or suggest the invention as it is defined in claims 1, 22, 36, and 37. All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Should any further objections remain, applicants herewith request an

#### **Interview**

with the Examiner. The Examiner is requested to telephone counsel should the claims not yet be considered allowable.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 3-37 are solicited.

Enclosed is counsel's payment of \$ 500.00 for two additional claims over twenty and one extra independent claim over three. Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



Werner H. Stermer (Reg. No. 34,956)

WHS:bh - November 7, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101